

Application No. 10/694,494

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of October 8, 2004, Applicants have carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicants believe that the claims as amended are allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In this first office action of October 8, 2004, claims 1-3, and 9-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,218,350, to Bollman (hereinafter Bollman). Claims 4-8, and 15, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of base and intervening claims. The Applicants wish to express appreciation for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Bollman teaches that image appearance characteristics for a display may be defined by two data sets, a first standard data set for the image, and a second set for the area to be dodged, where the dodged area is separated from the remainder of the image by a series of edges. The appearance of any particular pixel in the original is determined by the first bit, or control plane, of the image data, the state of which indicates that pixel appearance is determined by one of the first or second data sets. To soften the transition of the image from one data set to another data set, at the dodged area edges, a filter function is applied to the control plane values, acting on areas adjacent the edge, to create a distribution of control plane values over an area adjacent to the edge. Error diffusion or dithering of the filtered values is then applied to quantize intermediate values generated by the filter function to legal values giving the illusion that the edge changes gradually from the first data set to the second data set, thereby creating a softened edge effect, using only a single control bit in the image data.

Application No. 10/694,494

Bollman is not unknown to the Applicants, please see page 3, lines 18-33, of the Applicant's specification where Bollman is expressly disclosed. As is well understood by those skilled in the art, the approach taught by Bollman, is one of "conditional dilation". In contrast the teaching as taught and as claimed by the Applicants in the specification of the present Application is the utilization of "selective dilation". Considerable discussion and explanation of the differences between "conditional dilation" and the Applicant's "selective dilation" is taught in the present Application at page 7 lines 19-32, of the specification. Note in particular that *selective* dilation includes "the dilation of those shape edges which are only perpendicular to the fast scan direction, or in the alternative only perpendicular to the slow scan direction of an image marking process", please see page 7, lines 30-33. Bollman does not teach "selective dilation".

A §102 "anticipation" rejection requires that a single reference teach (i.e., identically describe) each and every element of the rejected claim. That is, §102 anticipation requires that all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within a single prior art reference. As Bollman does not teach "selective dilation", it fails as a §102(b) "anticipation" reference. Allowance of claims 1-3, and 9-14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-8, and 15 depend from a claim believed allowable and should therefore be allowable as well. Allowance of claims 4-8, and 15 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/694,494

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher D. Wait
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,230
Telephone (585) 423-6918

January 10, 2005
CDW/fsl
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644